DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 372 829 PS 022 375

AUTHOR Goetz, Kathy, Ed.
TITLE Creating New Schools: Planning and Implementation Guide for School-Based Comprehensive Collaborative Services Programs.
INSTITUTION Family Resource Coalition, Chicago, IL.; National Resource Center for Family Support Programs, Chicago, IL.
SPONS AGENCY Annie E. Casey Foundation, Greenwich, CT.; Department of Health and Human Services, Washington, D.C.; John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, Chicago, IL.
PUB DATE 93
CONTRACT 90-CJ-0960
NOTE 47p.
AVAILABLE FROM Family Resource Coalition, 200 South Michigan Avenue, Suite 1520, Chicago, IL 60604.
PUB TYPE Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Community Programs; *Cooperative Programs; *Family Programs; Program Development; Program Implementation; *School Community Relationship; *Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Family Resource and Support Programs; Family Support; *School Based Services

ABSTRACT

Applicable to any school district or school interested in starting a family resource and support program, this guide provides help for both planning and implementation of family resource and youth services centers. It outlines the philosophy behind family resource and youth services centers and how that philosophy is to be reflected in all aspects of the program. The guide is not intended to prescribe any particular program model or the unique methods of planning, designing, financing, or evaluation of each center. Rather, planners are expected to be creative and innovative, using the ideas contained in the guide as springboards for their own thinking. Program flexibility at the local level and an emphasis on encouraging new ideas that emerge from the people participating in the centers are the hallmarks of the family support movement throughout the country. Following an introduction, the philosophy of family resource and youth services centers is discussed. A section on center planning outlines the following eight steps: (1) establishing an advisory council; (2) completing a needs/resources assessment; (3) determining rationale, missions, goals, and objectives; (4) designing a program; (5) assuring successful operations; (6) clarifying the oversight process; (7) thinking about the budget; and (8) planning for appropriate evaluation. Four appendices contain a statement of the premises, principles, and practices of family resource programs; a statement of program goals; an annotated bibliography of 33 items; and a sample workplan. (TJQ)

National Resource Center for Family Support Programs
Family Resource Coalition

ED 372 829

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CREATING NEW SCHOOLS

Planning and Implementation Guide for School-Based Comprehensive Collaborative Services Programs

PS 022375

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Paul Deane

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table of Contents

About the Family Resource Coalition ii

Acknowledgments iii

Background on this Guide iv

Introduction 1

Philosophy of Family Resource and Youth Services Centers 3

Planning a Center 5

- Establishing an Advisory Council 6
- Completing a Community Needs/Resources Assessment 7
- Determining Rationale and Mission 9
- Designing the Program 11
- Assuring Successful Operations 20
- Clarifying the Oversight Process 24
- Thinking about the Budget 26
- Evaluation Strategies 28

Some Final Thoughts 30

Appendix A: Premises, Principles, and Practices of Family Resource Programs 31

Appendix B: Goals 34

Appendix C: Bibliography 35

Appendix D: Sample Workplan 41

About the Family Resource Coalition

The Family Resource Coalition is the central source for leadership and information in the family support field. It develops resources for family support programs, provides information for formulating public policies, and documents activities and outcomes of current work in the field. Coalition services and activities include:

- consulting, technical assistance, and training services for programs, schools, and government;
- working in the public policy arena to communicate relevant issues and concerns of those in the family support field and to educate leaders about the principles, successes, and promises of the family support approach;
- providing leadership at the national level to plan strategy and the allocation of resources for continued growth of the field;
- publishing the *FRC Report*, a quarterly devoted to family support issues and the *FRC Connection*, a networking newsletter for Coalition members, and other manuals, monographs, and books for family support professionals.
- sponsoring a national conference on family support issues.

The National Resource Center for Family Support Programs, a division of the Family Resource Coalition, is charged with identifying and developing quality resource materials on programs. Further duties of the NRC are to:

- make available state-of-the-art knowledge on program design, administration, staffing, and financing;
- enhance information flow, networking, and collaboration among programs;
- track federal, state, and local policy initiatives;
- link family support to other services for families and children;
- create a technical assistance network of experts and deliver technical assistance services.

Among the products being developed by the NRC are a computerized database and retrieval system, an annual inventory of state initiatives, bibliographies on major topics, technical assistance resource papers, and other publications.

Acknowledgements

Funding for this planning and implementation guide was made possible by the Annie E. Casey Foundation, the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, the Ford Foundation, and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services under grant 90-CJ-0960 for the National Resource Center for Family Support Programs. The Family Resource Coalition is grateful for their support for this project and their continued interest in programs which strengthen families.

Background on this Guide

This guide is designed to be used in both the planning and implementation of family resource and youth services centers. An earlier version of this manual was produced for the Kentucky Interagency Task Force on Family Resource and Youth Services Centers with funding from the Annie E. Casey Foundation. It has since been revised to be applicable to any school district or school interested in starting a family resource and support program.

This guide outlines the philosophy behind family resource and youth services centers and how that philosophy is to be reflected in all aspects of the program. It is not intended to prescribe any particular program model or the unique methods of planning, designing, financing, or evaluating each center. Planners are expected to be creative and innovative, using the ideas contained here as springboards for their own thinking. Program flexibility at the local level and an emphasis on encouraging new ideas that emerge from the people participating in the centers are hallmarks of the family support movement throughout the country.

There is currently a tremendous amount of information being published on school-based family support programs. Appendix C contains a relevant bibliography.

Some of the information here is drawn from three Coalition publications: *Programs to Strengthen Families*, a directory of many different family resource programs around the country; *Family Resource Program Builder*, a complete blueprint for designing and operating programs for parents; and *Building Strong Foundations*, which contains full explanations of evaluation strategies including sample data collection forms. Each book contains many specific examples and listings of additional resources for particular program components and issues that have been part of other family resource and support programs.

A complete publications list and order form can be obtained by writing the Family Resource Coalition, 200 S. Michigan Avenue, Suite 1520, Chicago IL 60604.

Introduction

For the past thirty years, research into children's educational achievement has shown that certain behaviors of the child's family are the most accurate predictors of the child's ultimate educational achievement. Years ago, the occupation of the child's father was the best predictor; more recently, other factors, such as the mother's educational status and the number of times a child changes schools have also proven to be effective predictors. So, by itself, even the best school can have only limited influence on the child's achievement. However, it seems that a strong family life and parents' positive attitudes toward school and involvement in the educational process of their children encourage students' academic success. Therefore, by reaching out to and engaging parents, and creating an effective partnership with families, school districts can hope to boost academic outcomes for students.

Programs for families and parents designed to promote a child's success in school are developing at a rapid pace across the country. School-based or school-linked programs tend to fall into three major categories:

1) **School-readiness programs**— These programs emphasize using the early years in a child's development to prepare the child for success in school and to involve parents in preparing their children for school. School readiness programs provide services primarily to mother and child, often when the child is an infant. Some programs are designed to provide services on a one-to-one basis in the family's home—such as the Parents as Teachers Program in Missouri. Others emphasize early childhood, center-based programming, such as Family and Child Development Centers operating in all school districts in Minnesota.

2) **Parent involvement programs**— While parent involvement programs have existed in many schools for years, the PTA being the best known, current parent involvement initiatives are based on the concept of a partnership, recognizing that both families and schools contribute to the educational process. Moving beyond traditional parent involvement activities, such as attending parent-teacher conferences and monitoring children's homework, these new programs may involve parents more actively in the classroom as teacher's aides, and in school management in areas of curriculum

review and school policy decisions. The School Development Program, developed by Dr. James Comer of the Yale Child Study Center, is an example of a highly successful program of this nature.

3) **Comprehensive collaborative services programs**—In these programs, schools serve as a focal point for the provision of other community-based services for families. Services are provided to children and their families through a collaboration among schools, health-care providers, and other local social service agencies. In this model, the schools are among the central participants in planning and governing the collaborative effort. Services may be provided at the school or at a site near the school.

The programs discussed in this volume, family resource and youth services centers, are comprehensive collaborative services programs. The success of these programs appears to lie in each program's uniqueness: their tangible "ownership" by the people who participate in them, their consistency with values and opinions in the communities where programs operate, and their ability to draw upon and innovatively utilize available community resources.

Family resource and youth services centers are not just another social service or another school program designed for "problem" children. They represent a new approach to service collaboration which combines the resources inherent in each family and the existing services in a community, including school resources, in an intentional, carefully designed plan to enhance and facilitate the relationships among these potential supporters of children in their school life. The result should be a holistic support system that will empower children to succeed in school, and their families to assist them in the best possible way.

Experiences from existing programs indicate that there are several elements crucial to insuring the long-term success of a community-based family resource or youth services program. Successful plans for new family resource programs and youth services centers usually include the following approaches:

- understanding the basic principles behind this kind of program and applying them in all aspects of program planning and implementation;
- planning a program with broad community involvement and particular input from potential program participants;
- designing a program responsive to th community-identified needs which emerge from the planning process and to the total resources available in the community;
- proposing a realistic evaluation strategy that will aid in the long-term evolution of an effective program; and
- planning from the beginning for changes in the program that inevitably occur when participants have a large voice in its governance.

Family resource and youth services centers may not be able to pay for every service that families and children might need. Centers should, however, provide an environment that will address children's needs in a unified way, increase the families' capacity to support their children in school, and creatively involve other available resources, public and private, in support of families and children. Collaboration among publicly funded services at the local community level is essential for these programs to work effectively.

Philosophy of Family Resource and Youth Services Centers

Family resource programs and youth services centers represent a major departure from the traditional services provided by schools and human service agencies. They take a holistic approach to coordinating support for children and families, increasing the potential for school success. They aim to facilitate a child's strong, nurturing relationship with an adult, usually a parent, in order to foster the child's self-esteem and encourage his or her success.

This approach is based on research findings which consistently show that the presence of such a relationship is an important contributing factor to a child's success in school. Working with parents in family resource centers, and with teens and their families in youth services centers, the programs coordinate and enhance families' capacities to support their children.

Distinguishing Characteristics

Three basic elements distinguish family resource and youth services centers from other approaches:

1) the nature of the relationship between the program and the families or students they serve;

2) the intentional coordinating and blending of different services, both public and private; and

3) a reliance on the resources of the participants themselves.

First, the relationship between program and participant is the most important element in the program. It is a relationship characterized by equality and respect. In contrast to school, where attendance is compulsory, participation in these programs is voluntary. Unlike most publicly funded services, participants do not need to have a problem to be eligible for services. It is the program's obligation to be accessible, relevant, culturally competent, and sufficiently attractive to establish a productive partnership with the intended participants. This relationship,is the vehicle through which the program's goals are accomplished.

Second, family resource and youth services centers view every resource available in a community as part of their programs and actively seek ways to gain access to them, often in non-traditional ways. Centers

start with a family's needs, then find and fit services to meet those needs instead of the other way around. Obviously, not every center will have the funding to provide a luxurious array of professional services for every family, free of charge. But at a minimum, centers are a comprehensive source of information and support to families about services and other support available in their communities. At the most complex level, centers will coordinate services in a variety of ways, from serving as initial advocates for their families to having all services provided on-site with planning and staffing done by an interdisciplinary consortium of agencies.

Third, family resource and youth services centers assume that the people in the program are its most valuable resource, and design programs around that assumption. Even the terminology of "participant" rather than "client," "case," or "referral" reflects the expectation that services are not a one-way street. Families represent the best possible potential support for their children, as well as the potential to become resources for other families through the networks that develop in the centers. Teens can grow and support each other in a conducive atmosphere.

Differences between Family Resource and Youth Services Centers

For older children, families begin to play a more peripheral role in decision-making and control, a transition that is often difficult for both parent and teen. By the time they are in high school, teenagers have already begun to make decisions on their own. They are capable of creating and using their own support networks and services, as well as of making decisions with negative consequences. The youth services center must respond both to the teens themselves—establishing relationships that promote growth and development and create effective connections with community service—and to the parents of teens, establishing relationships that enable parents to support their teens as well as they can.

New and Not So New

The philosophy behind these new kinds of programs is a very old-fashioned one. What these programs are supposed to do for their participants is the same thing that once was done by extended families and networks of kindly neighbors and churches in small towns: they are supposed to care what happens to people and help them get what they need when they need it. Like the best of their predecessors, the centers will not always have all the resources every family needs. But they will always attempt to provide sympathy and support, and to point a student or a family in the right direction for assistance elsewhere. In the old-fashioned system, no one demanded that a referral slip be produced, or examined whether someone was eligible for assistance, or assumed that someone who needed momentary help had a permanent problem. In return, those who received help were expected to contribute what they could back into the system, helping someone else when the time came. They were recognized as invaluable resources for themselves and for others.

That idealized system of old-fashioned help is hard to find these days, and can be especially absent in communities hard hit by economic adversity. Family resource and youth services centers are an attempt to re-create some aspects of the old ways: a warm and welcoming atmosphere respectful of the people who participate, a common-sense approach to families' overall needs, a useful point of access to all the resources available for families and students in a community, and an expectation that the participants in the program can be its greatest resource.

Planning a Center

This guide is designed to help planners through the stages to a fully formed center plan. It is important to define the steps involved in the actual process of planning a center. They will usually occur in the following order:

1. Establishing an Advisory Council
2. Completing a Needs/Resources Assessment
3. Determining Rationale, Missions, Goals, and Objectives
4. Designing the Program
5. Assuring Successful Operations
    - Information Dissemination
    - Training
    - Parental Consent and Confidentiality
    - Involving Families
    - Minimizing Stigma
6. Clarifying the Oversight Processs
    - Advisory Council Role
    - Representatives to the Advisory Council
    - Relationships with Local Board of Education
7. Thinking about the Budget
    - Public and Private Resources
8. Evaluation Strategies
    - Year-End Evaluation
    - Data Collection for Evaluation
    - Revisiting Last Year's Plan

1. Establishing an Advisory Council

Community involvement, especially involvement of the targeted participants in the center, is essential from the very beginning if the program is to succeed. A family resource program designed by a clever grant-writer without the substantial, meaningful participation of ALL potential partners—parents, school personnel, private agencies, and state agency personnel—from the outset has never been known to succeed. An advisory council should be assembled at the very beginning of the planning process. (See more on advisory councils in the Clarifying Oversight section.)

Two categories of representatives deserve note and should have special outreach devoted to their participation: low-income parents and youth targeted by the center, and those service providers who will be directly involved with families using the center, including school personnel. Meaningful input from school professionals and service providers who will ultimately be expected to collaborate with the center should go beyond written agreements and informational meetings to hands-on planning and decision-making whenever possible.

Direct participation as a member of the advisory council is only one way to gain meaningful input from these essential people. Planners should use all possible means to insure maximum participation during the design phase. Focus groups, surveys, and interviews are additional techniques which can elicit input from people not on the council.

In many cases, the very parents and youth whom the centers are designed to serve are the most reluctant to be involved with the school in any way. Creative ways should be sought to connect with hard-to-reach parents and children for input during the planning process, to achieve the community involvement needed for the center to be successful.

For example: An advisory council could invite 15 students who dropped out of school during the past year to have pizza with the council and critique the plans for in-school job counseling or other activities designed to help keep students in school. Would such activities have made any difference to these students? What would be the most effective way to carry them out? Are there other methods that the drop-outs think would be better? Why?

For example: A social worker or teacher could visit five parents who had not been in touch with the school in the past two years and survey their needs for childcare, better communication with the school, or other services a family resource center might provide. The purpose of these home visits would be to assesss why these families have not been in touch with the school and what strategies might attract them to participate in a family resource center or other services they need.

---

2. Completing a Needs/Resources Assessment

Planning for any endeavor, including family resource and youth services centers, involves asking at least two questions: What problems should we be trying to solve? What current resources are available for solving them? Those planning family resource and youth services centers need to ask an additional question: Is there a better way to use the available resources to solve the problems?

The first step is assembling available information. School districts are likely to have current information on school-related issues and some aggregate data on the students and families enrolled in the school, and this information should be made available to the advisory council. Planners should also investigate additional demographic data and information on social indicators such as unemployment, drug abuse, homelessness, crime rates, divorces and child abuse cases, and any other information that is deemed to be important in the particular community they serve. Statistics broken down by race or income level may tell a different story than the overall numbers. Information may be available from a variety of sources: census data, state agency statistics, local government data collection, and private agency surveys.

For example: Interviewing several families who are potential users of the center, especially those known to have contact with a variety of service systems in a community, will contribute to a total picture of community needs. Gathering information from a family's perspective, especially a family with many needs, will help to identify problems and gaps in services, not be apparent from an initial assessment of resources.

The second step in the needs/resource assessment process is to document the available community resources, both public and private. The first priority is documenting the existence of program components that are currently operating in the community. Establishing relationships early with the staff in these programs is also essential; they may be helpful in the overall planning process and they will certainly play a role in the eventual success of the center. They may have gathered other information in the course of their activities that can be helpful to the center's plans. Understanding their approaches and methods of operation is important for planning appropriate linkages between them and the family resource and youth services center.

The second priority is locating and assessing the other publicly funded services available to children and families in your community. The local school (especially the social worker, guidance counselor or other school personnel who are responsible for contacting other agencies) is a good place to start in locating the key local contacts for these services.

Be sure to make a realistic assessment of how well these services are meeting the needs that already exist in your community. For example, it is not sufficient to know that juvenile justice diversion services are provided in your county. You need to know how many youth and families are currently being served, what the caseloads are, what the maximum caseloads should be, and whether or not it is realistic to assume that any additional assistance for the center could come from this source. If that system is already seriously overloaded in your community, the family resource or youth services centers are likely to run into problems in

referring families to that service, and youth and families are not likely to be able to get the help they need in a timely way. These issues need to be considered in the initial planning so that unexpected surprises don't occur later in the process.

For example: If the resource assessment indicates that there are childcare slots available but unused, further investigation should find out why: Is the quality poor? Is the eligibility too complicated? Is transportation available? If the assessment shows many drug abuse programs but only a few participants, there may be a mismatch of program to need, not a lack of need. Input from targeted center participants and families most in need should be solicited through any available means (surveys, focus groups, interviews, home visits) if the information collected by other means does not parallel the needs expressed by parents and youth.

The third priority is documenting the wide variety of private resources in the community that already provide a range of supportive services for children and families or would have the potential to provide additional supports. These resources are invaluable to families in the community and should be formally linked with family resource or youth services center. Informal networks of parents, parent education groups, child abuse prevention councils, substance abuse prevention networks, and other resources that exist outside formal organizations should also be included. They represent additional sources of support and information for families, and may be exactly the resources many families need most.

Then comes the most complicated part of the process: analyzing the information and forging a consensus among Advisory Council members about the needs to be met by a center. More information from particular segments of the community, especially families most in need, may be needed to complete the picture at this stage.

Once a center gets started, the needs/resources process should continue, with the center's advisory council collecting new information as it becomes available in the community. This ongoing assessment should continue to guide the development of the center as the workplan unfolds and adjustments need to be made. A continuous process will make it easier to document the changes that each succeeding year's plan should include.

3. Determining Rationale, Mission, Goals, and Objectives

Once the needs/resources assessment is completed, and a clear picture of the needs to be addressed by the center has emerged, the advisory council should agree on a written rationale for the center they envision. The rationale statement should answer the question of WHY? Why does your community need this program? Why are the specific problems you hope to solve best solved through a family resource and youth service center strategy? Why are the identified problems not being adequately addressed through the existing community resources?

The mission statement for the center should answer the question of WHAT? What is the unique role of the family resource or youth services center in your community as it relates to other services for families? What is the vision for the center as it develops? What do you hope to accomplish by having the center in your community?

These statements are important for the center's successful establishment and development. They should emerge from a consensus of the people guiding the planning and implementation process and should guide center decisions from this point forward. Every program decision should be made from the standpoint of WHY ARE WE MAKING THIS CHOICE? and WHAT DO WE REALLY HOPE TO ACCOMPLISH? When a sticking point emerges in the program design or in constructing a budget to support it, it will be valuable to refer back to the rationale and the mission.

Once the overall rationale and mission are determined, the next step is to translate those general statements into specific goals and objectives for the center workplan. A list of suggested goals for family resource and youth services centers is included in this manual. (Appendix B) Planners should use or change these goals or articulate new ones based on the needs assessment for their local communities. In developing the workplan, listings from the needs assessment should be connected to each goal adopted by the center.

Programs should be expected to grow and change over time as the relationships behind them evolve. The goals and objectives called for in the workplan should reflect an understanding of the developmental nature of the program and should take into consideration that developing effective working relationships with families and with other service providers takes time.

Objectives should also reflect the programmatic tension that will exist as centers attempt to create a welcoming environment and common activities for all families while at the same time devising effective methods to reach families who are not likely to initiate contact with the center. Most centers will operate with the assumption that children, youth and families whose needs are most urgent will be the top priority. The center's objectives should reflect how the described priority will be put into practice in the center.

For example: A long-term objective might be to have 50 families participate in an activity of the family resource centerweekly, but a realistic initial objective might be to attract 50 families to come to the center at least once during the first six months, or to get five families who have never come to a school event to attend at least one. (The effort expended to get five hard-to-reach families may vastly exceed the effort needed to reach more involved families!)

Objectives should explicitly state what programs hope to achieve. Working out one highly collaborative, effective agreement between the center and one essential service may be a realistic and therefore adequate target for the first year.

For example: A long-term objective might be to ensure that every participant in a substance abuse program receive job counseling as part of the treatment plan. An initial objective might be to get an agreement between the providers of both services to try a pilot group of five participants who would receive priority in the job counseling program while enrolled in the substance abuse program.

---

4. Designing the Program

Once goals and objectives have been determined, the skeleton of the workplan is in place. A sample workplan form is included (see Appendix D). It allows description of specific tasks and timelines related to the goals and objectives defined above. Core components must be addressed, along with other activities essential to the center's success. But there is much more to designing a workable center than filling out the forms.

The plans should demonstrate a clear understanding of the PROCESS necessary to establish an effective program. Sometimes that process is not easily captured in quantifiable goals, objectives, and tasks.

An innovative program which is based on a new configuration of relationships among service providers, on the marketing of a new idea to a whole community, and on substantial input from a newly- selected council requires a lot of time to establish itself. Relationship-building among the various partners in the center is just as critical in the early stages as relationship-building with the parents and students who will use the center. Whether the specifics of such training and team-building are specified in a workplan or not, they are essential to the long-term success of the program. The program cannot work without an explicit focus on relationship-building and time for the relationships to become effective partnerships. While planners will be eager to begin services and show results quickly, it is preferable to exercise caution about taking on too many things at once before the center is firmly established.

In the last few years, collaborative efforts have become very popular. Everywhere state and local governments, as well as community level coalitions, support the need for collaborations. Most argue that, through greater communication and coordination, public services can be made better. Experience has shown, however, that collaboration involves more than just communication or coordination. Communication can help people do their jobs better by providing more complete information, but does not require joint activities. Coordination involves joint activities, but allows organizations and individuals to maintain their own sets of goals, expectations, and responsibilities.

Collaboration among agencies requires the identification of shared goals to guide the collaborators' shared actions. As a general rule, the most successful interagency collaborations are effective because all of the individual members and organizations involved are willing to relinquish some of their individual control and authority in order to progress towards the greater good of children and families.

In order for collaboration to result in a new direction for the community, the planning process should include all of the following elements:

- jointly developing and agreeing to a set of common goals and directions;
- sharing responsibility for obtaining those goals; and
- working together to achieve those goals, using the expertise of each collaborator.

A community coalition that can successfully incorporate these elements into its planning process stands a good chance of turning its members' separate values, hopes, and dreams into a single vision and direction. Understanding the nature of the collaborative process is essential throughout the life of the center for its continued success.

Long-term planning should enumerate intermediate steps which will build on initial ones over time, showing the planned development of the center. The experience of similar programs in a variety of communities indicates that an effective program achieves stability in about three years. That means that first-year plans will look quite different from second-year ones if the center is on target developmentally.

The needs/resources assessment and the goals development process should provide the basic information necessary for taking the next step in designing the program. Two sets of questions need to be addressed to translate the community assessment into a specific program design.

The first set of questions addresses the issue of existing services in the community.

1)What services are available? Where are the gaps in services?

2)What services should have a high priority according to the needs assessment analysis? What services have a low priority?

3)What services could be provided directly by the center? What services would be provided by referral?

4)How will services be provided by the center? Can other providers work directly at the center? How will services be provided by referral?

The second set of questions is equally important:

1)What are the demographics of the families/ youth that will be served by the center?

2)What is the nature of the community in which the center will be located?

3)What is the size of the budget or amount of funding available for the center?

Some examples of how answers to these questions can translate into program design follow.

Community A

The local elementary school is applying for funds for a family resource center. The community is service/resource poor. There is very little preschool or after-school childcare, and no support and training for childcare providers. There are very few parent training opportunities in the community, but the school does have a literacy program for parents. There are adequate health care resources but access to these services is difficult and they are therefore under-used.

The community is rural, with families living some distance from each other and from available services. A majority of the families are two-parent families living at or below the poverty level, and at least one parent is not working outside the home. Families in the community experience a high rate of health problems, alcoholism, and domestic violence. Because many of the parents of the families are not working, childcare is not deemed a high priority as a program component. Health care is considered a high priority.

Program planners realize there is not enough funding available to finance completely new services programs. Instead, they decide to earmark $10,000 from the school budget to supplement the existing parent literacy service. The money will be used to hire a home-visitor who will work closely with the literacy program to recruit families to the program; to reinforce learning experiences from the program during home visits; to introduce learning activities that parents and elementary-school-age children can do at home; and to facilitate the families use of existing health-care services. A small part of the budget will also be used to establish Alcoholics Anonymous and other self-help groups at three community churches.

Community B

Community B is an economically depressed, mid-sized town. The community has a well-established, effective Community Action Program (CAP) and because of this, health services and survival services are available in the community. The CAP agency also administers several day-care programs and a Head Start program, although all these programs have waiting lists. There is no school age childcare in the community, and no programs providing parenting services.

Families in the community are working poor, many involved in seasonal employment. Most of the families are characterized as single-female head of households and the community is experiencing an increasing number of teen parents. Single-parent families are always at risk due to stress, and the increasing rate of child abuse in the community confirms this.

Pre-school childcare and school-age childcare are high priorities because most of the single parents must work to support their families. Parent support to assist parents in coping with related stress and child-rearing issues is also a high priority. Health care and other social services are a low priority because they are provided by the CAP agency.

The program planners submit a request to the state department of education for a grant of $40,000 to fund a family resource program that will have two components: 1) a day-care referral and provider training program and 2) a parent resource and support program. Space will be provided at either the school or the CAP agency for a resource center or library of materials that could be used by both day-care providers and parents groups.

The day-care referral and training program would work within the community to establish family day-care homes including those for school-age children and preschool-age children. This program would also coordinate and/or provide ongoing training and support for family day care providers as well as day-care providers at existing day care and Head Start programs. The parent resource and support program would provide life management skills classes, parent support groups, family events, and parent education groups at both the family resource center and at day-care program sites. Close coordination is to be maintained with the CAP agency and cross- referrals will be made for all families using the CAP agency and the family resource center.

Community C

Community C is in an urban area. While the community itself has few services, there are services scattered throughout the city. These services, however, are not conveniently located or easily accessible to the residents of Community C.

The city has a large number of preschool childcare programs, but few school-age childcare programs. There is one parent literacy program and a parent education program run by the city. Health services and social services are also available. The city is also funding and operating a successful employment counseling, training and placement program for youth, but this service is located in and serves the residents of another community in the city.

The residents of Community C live at or below the poverty level. A high number of families in the community rely on public aid and the statistics show that many of the families have a long-term dependency on public aid, with second and third generations dependent on welfare. Demographics also indicate that the families in Community C are large, with an average of four children, and that there is an increasing rate of drug and alcohol abuse among the youth in the community. All services are a high priority for this community.

The local high school and two elementary schools submit a proposal to a community foundation for $90,000 to fund a combined family resource and youth services

center in Community C. The center is to be located in a storefront that is easily accessible to all community residents. The core of the program will be a strong information and referral service with one full-time staffperson to work as a family advocate. Referrals will be made to day-care and Head Start programs and health services in nearby communities. The program planners have worked closely with the city family services agency and with the parent education program. These two organizations will provide parenting groups on-site at the family resource and youth services center. The family service agency will also provide, on a small subcontract, family crisis intervention, a teen/parent communication workshop, and counseling at the center.

Program planners have also made arrangements with the city's employment training program to allow 20 youths from Community C to attend the nearest program. The planners are negotiating with the city to fund a similar program at the center in Community C and plan to have the program operating within a year. A drug abuse prevention program initially funded by federal substance abuse prevention money will be expanded in the high school and will reach out to elementary schools under funding from the grant. The center will also be seeking additional foundation grants to open a school-age childcare program .

Program Design Notes

In working with teens, it is especially important to find appropriate ways for both teens and their parents to feel ownership of the center activities. Some activities for parents and youth together should at least be attempted, but more commonly, in acknowledging the developmental stage of teenagers, there will be different and separate activities for parents and teens.

Experienced center coordinators often report that, in spite of the best and most comprehensive plans, much of their time is actually taken up with managing crises brought to them by center participants. In designing a strong program, planners should take this crisis management function into account and make specific plans for meeting this need. A specific plan should provide for crisis assistance outside the center, coordination with the school's plans for crisis intervention, and accommodation for time that inevitably will be spent in this way. In communities where crisis is a way of life for many families, there may be a temptation to overuse the center's program for this purpose. Planners should keep in mind a strong bias toward preventive activities, which should, over time, help to alleviate the crises.

Examples of Program Models

The following are examples of school-based integrated services models. The first three programs described are state-initiated, multi-site programs. The final two are smaller, single-site programs.

The program models described here should be viewed as idea-generators, to be used creatively in establishing centers. Keep in mind that all the components mentioned in these program descriptions cannot possibly be provided on-site by the center itself. Coordination and cooperation with other community resources is vital to covering all the services that families in your community need. Each family resource and youth services center should be a unique blend of components and approaches, responsive to its own community's needs and priorities. Each center will weave its own tapestry of services depending on location, needs of the families involved, available funding, and the vision of the people shaping the program.

State of New Jersey School Based Youth Services Program (1988)

New Jersey's School Based Youth Services Program (SBYSP) is the first statewide effort

in the nation to provide a comprehensive package of services in or near high schools. The primary focus of the SBYSP is to provide adolescents, especially those at high risk of school failure, with the support necessary to complete their education, to obtain skills that lead to employment, and to lead mentally and physically healthy and drug-free lives. Established in early 1988 by the Department of Human Resources, SBYSP attempts to eliminate the artificial boundaries between the education and human services systems and to ensure that students receive appropriate and responsive services. SBYSP operates in 29 urban, rural, and suburban school districts, with at least one per 21 counties. These programs provide teenagers with a full spectrum of services on a "one-stop shopping" basis.

Each site provides the following core services:

- health care
- employment counseling, training and placement
- summer and part-time job development
- drug and alcohol abuse counseling
- family crisis counseling
- primary and prevention healthcare
- academic counseling
- referrals to health and social providers.

Other optional services include:

- day care
- teen parenting
- vocational education
- family planning
- transportation
- hotlines.

At the beginning of the 1991-1992 school year, four programs were opened that service young students grades K-8. These sites offer similar services in elementary and middle schools that feed into the existing 29 SBYSP sites established in secondary schools.

Connecticut Family Resource Center Program (1990)

Connecticut's Family Resource Center Program is designed to provide a comprehensive, integrated, community-based system of family support and child development services located in a school building. The Family Resource Center Program was established in the later part of 1988, on a demonstration basis, by the Department of Human Resources. Originally there were three program sites—one urban, one suburban and one rural—and since then, five additional sites have been added. The centers are located in school buildings and benefit from their close association and alliance with a well-known, highly respected, and widely-used community institution, the school. Rather than being an additional burden on school staff and administration, the centers are operated by early childhood specialists, who come to the school facilities to provide services. Beginning with new and expectant parents, centers provide a coordinated local service structure through which families access parent education, parent training, family support, infant/toddler, pre-school and school-age childcare services, and family day care homes.

Services include:

- prenatal information and guidance
- child development education
- periodic hearing and vision screening
- home visits
- peer support groups
- adult education services, such as
  - basic skills preparation
  - English as a Second Language (ESL)
  - GED classes, and classes in
  - family management practices
- information and referral services
- teen pregnancy prevention services

- child care services
- support and training services for family day care providers.

State of Kentucky Family Resource and Youth Service Centers Program

Kentucky's Family Resource and Youth Service Centers represent one of the nation's most ambitious education reform initiatives. The Kentucky Education Reform Act (KERA) of 1990 authorized support for Family Resource and Youth Service Centers in all elementary and high schools that have 20 percent or more of their students eligible for free or reduced-priced school lunch. The Family Resource and Youth Services Centers are designed to coordinate a community's social and health services for students and their families. Although the centers provide some services directly, the majority of their efforts are focused on accessing existing community services for families. In addition, centers work closely with state agencies to identify gaps in services and plan effective responses to the gaps.

Family Resource Centers offer:

- full-time preschool childcare
- after-school childcare
- "families in training"
- parent and child education
- support and training for childcare providers
- positive parent-child activities

Youth Service Centers provide:

- health services
- employment service(s)
- summer and part-time job development
- family crisis and mental health counseling
- drug and alcohol abuse counseling
- referrals to health and social services
- transportation
- recreation activities.

New Beginnings
San Diego, CA

New Beginnings is a multi-faceted city-wide effort in whose major goal is to "ensure the well-being of children and families." This initiative did not begin with a school focus; even now, school-linked services are only one component of its program.

New Beginnings, a partnership that spans jurisdictional and sector lines, includes both political and professional leadership. Top executives from the county Departments of Social Services and Health and Probation, the San Diego City Schools, the Community College District and the city Housing Commission, Parks and Recreation Department, library system, and police force are involved in the program, as well as the county's chief administrative officer and the city manager.

The school-linked component of New Beginnings is a demonstration center at Hamilton Elementary School, a school in an extremely challenged community. Here, the school site is a locus of comprehensive service delivery.

Families from the community and staff from the school and from service agencies participated in determining the center's services. Initially the center targeted Hamilton's 1300 students, grades K-5, and their families; future plans include expansion to pre-school-age children. Basic registration for school now takes place at the center rather than in the school's administrative offices in order to introduce all families to the center and its resources. The center offers parent education classes, healthcare services such as immunizations and basic physicals, and information about and referral to other community resources and services for families. A team of family services advocates provides service planning, counseling, and some direct services. The center-based staff is complemented by an "extended team." These team members remain in their own agencies but are trained and ready to take referrals from the Hamilton Center.

Probtsfield Elementary School
Moorhead, Minnesota

Teachers and school administrators at Probtsfield Elementary School understand the value of a family focus and are seeking to help their students by helping the families.

Among Probtsfield's students are youngsters from two nearby housing projects. School personnel were concerned that many of these children were performing poorly on school work, that they and their families had needs that were not being met, and that there was little trust between the families and the school. School officials reasoned that trust could be built and the children's achievement improved if parents saw the school as a source of help in solving problems. Probtsfield tackled this objective by developing an effective information and referral capacity in the school, rather than by bringing services to the school site itself.

The school began by asking all the human services agencies in the community to contribute information about their services to a resource manual for teachers. A copy of the manual was given to each teacher—making it much easier to use than if there were a copy in the library only—and the teachers received in-service training in how to identify problems and make referrals. With the help of the manual and training, teachers are now expected to explore family needs in parent-teacher conferences and to make referrals as appropriate.

To increase the likelihood that the referrals will result in a connection between the family and an agency that can help, agencies have representatives in the school building on the days parent-teacher conferences are held. Even though services beyond the initial conversation are provided off-site, through this arrangement a parent need only walk across the hall (rather than travel across town) to take the first step to act on the teacher's suggestion.

The last two models are paraphrased from The Future of Children: School-Linked Services *(Los Altos, CA: The David and Lucile Packard Foundation) Vol. 2, #1—Spring 1992.*

Staffing

The single most important decision for a new family resource or youth services program is hiring appropriate staff. The staff in many cases will BE the program. Staff personally set the tone for the center, define the relationships with all the other partners who will provide the services, and, most important of all, have the most direct contact with the center participants. The center plan should give a full job description for all staff to be hired and a full listing of the qualities and qualifications that will be looked for in hiring.

Initiating a family resource or youth services center will require hiring a staff. The number of staff will depend upon the size and nature of the program. Most programs will need a core of social service staff to ensure the coordination of other community services.

The most important qualification for a family resource or youth services staff is a proven capacity for building strong personal relationships. A large portion of the job will be similar to community organizing. A successful coordinator is personally warm, caring and friendly, and is likely to have extensive connections in the community through both professional and personal contacts. He or she should engage in public relations and communication with a variety of people as second nature, not as a chore to be done grudgingly. This person is also likely to have a reputation as a barrier-breaker, someone who can think creatively about solving problems and resolving disputes in an innovative way.

The second-most-important qualification is extensive experience in working with the types of families and children the center

will especially seek to serve. Staff should have an attitude of respect for all families and a non-judgmental approach to assisting families on their own terms. Experience in developing culturally competent programs for a variety of families would be a major plus. Anyone who has even a slight case of the "us and them" syndrome, dividing families from professionals who serve them, should not be a program staffperson.

Other personal qualities that make good center staff include a high level of initiative and an attitude of seeking out new ideas, people, and ways of doing things. An eagerness to learn should be accompanied by confidence in using prior experience as a base for building new skills. This center is not the place for a burned-out teacher, a losing football coach, or a staff member with whom no one wants to work. It is the place for a person with high energy, high enthusiasm, and a willingness to go the extra mile.

Program/Service Site

Many factors will determine the location of a center site, including the space available in the community and its appropriateness in view of the anticipated needs of the center. This is a decision that cannot be made lightly; other programs have demonstrated that the center's location and the way the it arranges its physical environment can have important implications.

The location of the center sends crucial messages about the center's attitude toward the people it serves, whether the center planners intend it or not. The first thing a potential center participant will know about the center is its location, and first impression is very important. It isn't everything, but overcoming a negative first impression is much harder than making the right one to begin with.

For example: Placing a center in an area within the school for programs designed for problem students would not send a message that this new program is intended to encourage participation by everyone.

For example: Locating a center away from the school could be a significant plus, especially if the school is not viewed as a positive, supportive place by many of the parents it is designed to serve, and if the location selected is known by parents to be accessible and welcoming. On the other hand, placing a center away from the school, for example in a little-used building that may be located on school property but far away from the rest of the school activities, may send a message that the center and its participants are not very important to the rest of the school.

The physical arrangements within the center are important as well. Centers should be warm and welcoming places, convenient to reach and easy to drop in on for families and students who might not usually voluntarily show up at a school or social service agency. The environment should be one of "ownership" by the participants as well as safety and confidentiality for sharing issues and problems. A quiet, sterile, classroom-type setting with a staffperson in control does not send the messages the center is should.

For example: The initial program for youth services centers in New Jersey required centers to provide recreational activities on-site as an inducement to teens to come in. Ping-pong tables, rock and roll posters, food, teenage clutter, and often loud talking and laughing were fundamental parts of the scene.

For example: Family support centers in Maryland banned desks of any kind from their centers, opting instead for comfortable sofas and chairs, shelves with toys and books, and rugs that encouraged parents to sit on the floor and play with their children during parent-child activities.

The space plans for the center should minimally include a large space for group activities such as classes and workshops, a segregated area for childcare while parents are in the center (for family resource centers), an enclosed private area where confidential interviews and conversations may take place when necessary, and some private and securable space for staff to keep records and plans. Keep in mind that ot all activities planned by the center must take place there, but the center should include these minimal requirements immediately and permanently.

All plans should fully describe both the planned location of the center and the plans for creating an appropriate physical environment for the center they envision. Assistance for the center coordinator in designing an appropriate environment might be included in the training section of the plans. Acquiring appropriate furnishings and equipment should be part of the community involvement and of budget plans described elsewhere in the plan.

Planners working to establish a center which would serve more than one school and those who choose a site away from the school should fully describe the location and why it would be the most suitable for a center. If the chosen site poses any potential barriers to encouraging full use of the center, they should be discussed fully, along with the rationale for choosing that site. If a substantial portion of center activities will take place away from the main site, these locations and their schedules should be noted as well.

5. Assuring Successful Operations

While the workplan will fully describe the plans for accomplishing each goal of each component, there are other basic aspects of the center's activities that are essential for it to work at all.

Information Dissemination

First impressions are vital in establishing a family resource or youth services center as the central point for its many activities and as a place where families and students are welcome. The initial circulation of the message is communicated through the establishment of the advisory council and the needs/resources assessment, which will spread the word about the future center and involve community members in the planning process. A plan for information dissemination should include the steps to be taken during the planning process to explain the center as well as the more formal program for publicizing the center once it is underway.

The school is the first and primary partner of the family resource center, and is an essential part of the center's communication network. Plans for the center should be included in regular communication with school personnel. Once the center is operational, school personnel should receive regular information about the center as well as written notification of meetings, training sessions, institutes and special events being scheduled.

Local publications, a grand opening event or series of events, targeted publicity in churches, clubs, and other organizations are other methods for reaching parents and the general public with initial information about the center. Once the center is operational, continued efforts should be made to keep these same constituencies informed about new center developments.

Information dissemination for centers involves much more than flyers or newspaper articles. Once the center is operational, the quickest, most efficient method of disseminating information about the center is word of mouth. The challenge is to ensure that what is going through this very effective grapevine is accurate and reflective of the intentions of the center program. The advisory council, school personnel, and other professionals in-the-know about center activities should be the core of the grapevine, and should be well informed about center activities.

What is happening in the center is the best advertisement of all, and the initial activities should be carefully planned to set the tone for further activities. Arts and crafts projects, experiences in nutrition (including plenty of free food!), fun activities like folk dancing for the whole family (recreation and dancing for teens), health screenings, opportunities for exercise, child care for parents while they attend center functions, and support and workshop groups around specific needs all send the message that the center is open to everyone and is responsive to the needs of its participants.

For those families who are not likely to read flyers sent home from school or articles in the local newspaper, and who are not part of a network where they would hear directly about center happenings, more specific kinds of outreach activities have to be devised. The first step is identifying who these families are, through comparing lists of parents who have participated in some activity with a list of families enrolled in the school, asking school personnel to make referrals of families they have not been successful in reaching, or receiving referrals from other agencies. The second step is reaching out. The most direct approach is a simple home visit by center

staff to welcome the family into the center, get input from them about what they would like to see in the center, and assess the possibilities for their participation. More home visits may be necessary. Other strategies could include modifications in the center's program, bringing some services to non-participating families, and referrals to other agencies.

Hard-to-reach teens, as well as some older family members, may be attracted to the center by something other than the promise of services. Food is always a popular route, especially if it meets some special criterion important to the participant and is accompanied by fun. Pizza or chicken or a popular dish from a particularly well-liked restaurant is a good place to start. Well-known sports stars, music by a current band, experts on a hot topic and special events connected with a particular date are well-established methods for attracting a crowd that might otherwise not show up.

Training

Without adequate team-building and training, a lot of chaos and frustration can surround the introduction of a new approach for staff to relate to parents and children, a new way of cooperation among a variety of professionals and service providers, and a new advisory council. This is especially true in the early stages of the program. Training for work in a family resource or youth services center differs greatly from traditional training that most coordinators may have experienced. It should include acquiring basic knowledge about the principles of family support and how they are put into practice in a center, understanding the role of a family support worker in working with families, and examination of methods of relationship-building. Training for advisory council members and other service partners should include building a common understanding about how each person involved in the work of the center will relate to the others and to the families who participate in the center.

Each member of the center's staff should be required to participate in a training event that will help them gain the overall skills they need for working with families and planning and managing a center. Members of the advisory council should be offered team- building opportunities to develop basic skills in working together as a decision-making group.

For example: If a center chooses to include parent education as one of the activities offered to families in the center, staff may need training in the particular curriculum chosen (such as Parents as Teachers or Effective Black Parenting).

For example: If a center has a strong linkage to the local parent literacy program, center staff need not be required to go through the training themselves, but it should probably be encouraged.

If the center's plan calls for center staff to carry out particular components themselves, additional training in that arena may also be necessary. If the center relies on other programs in the community to provide such services, center staff could go through a training with the outside providers to build a strong partnership and a clear understanding of what each component offers parents.

For example: If suicide prevention becomes an issue that should be addressed in a youth services center, staff would likely need additional training to help them to respond to this emerging need.

The training plan for centers should also reflect the expectation of continuing development in other aspects of the program: that training should be ongoing and should respond to the issues and problems that arise as the program develops. A one-time exposure to principles or techniques is not sufficient to maintain a high quality of practice in the center, nor adequate for responding to the different needs that emerge during the life of the center.

Center plans for training should include adequate time and funds for initial orientation, and at least one additional training opportunity for staff members each year. Provisions should be made to train advisory council members and collaborators, including school personnel, about center services. Information on training opportunities through the National Center for Community Education, Cities in Schools, the Family Resource Coalition's Conference, and other national organizations should be made available to centers on a regular basis.

Parental Consent and Confidentiality

Advisory councils, with input from state agencies involved, should develop consent forms and interagency confidentiality agreements. The advisory council should approve a parental consent form and a procedure for insuring that parents are fully informed about its meaning and content. These consent forms should not conflict with federal or state statutes.

Local staff of state agencies, with guidance from their state counterparts if necessary, should be involved in developing any agreements under which they will share information.

Planners be aware that the content of the forms and the procedures used in communicating with parents should complement the center's intent to be a welcoming, non-stigmatizing, non-bureaucratic place.

Involving Families

Involving families is what family resource and youth services centers are all about. It is the first priority of every center and should be reflected throughout every aspect of a center's plan. Planners should take the opportunity to look back over their plans to be sure that they have provided for all the possible avenues for participation by families in a center. "Ownership" by the families who participate in a center is the ultimate goal for every center, and plans should be made from the very beginning for this ownership to become a reality.

Families are not to be passive recipients of services in a family resource or youth services center; they are to be active, responsible participants in all aspects of the center. They should be both learners and teachers. They should be both receivers and givers of services. There should be opportunities for personal growth and development as well as opportunities to help others. Particular attention should be given to opportunities for families to have input into planning and carrying out future center activities and developing skills that will enable them to take leadership roles as the center evolves.

Minimizing Stigma

Minimizing stigma is an essential element in developing family resource and youth services centers for two reasons: first, to ensure an attitude of respect and dignity for

all families, regardless of their status or their problems, and second, to effectively attract families to use the centers.

Centers would do well to take some lessons from business on how to appeal to customers. It is safe to assume that most families would be reluctant to present themselves at the door of family resource center unless they were in the direst of emergencies if the center were labelled as a place for families with problems. If the funding for the center depended on how many at-risk families voluntarily used the center on a regular basis, there would be a greater incentive to understand why families come and why they don't — and to develop the best possible strategies for making sure that a sufficient number of "customers" show up. Minimizing the stigma attached to participating in a center should go a long way toward making sure that as many families as possible, including the at-risk youth and families, use the centers regularly.

A specific plan for minimizing stigma should not be necessary, if planners have adhered to the basic philosophy of the family support movement which underlies the establishment of family resource and youth services programs. Such centers are open to all, and there should be activities or services in the centers for every student and family; those activities should be advertised to all. Even so, it is helpful to highlight those aspects of the plan that will prevent stigma. This will provide an additional opportunity to be sure that nothing in the plan or in the language used to describe the plan brands the center as a place for high-risk families or problem children.

Opportunities for minimizing stigma exist in every aspect of the proposal: such as including a very broad cross-section of the community in the application process, carefully developing a rationale and mission that emphasizes the importance of the center to all families in the community, balancing the program components to provide a variety of options for families to become involved, and making an extraordinary effort to communicate the universality of the program through community outreach.

Some very successful programs have minimized stigma by emphasizing fun, trust-building activities to attract and involve as many different families as possible in the initial stages of the program. Later, when the program was well-established with a reputation as the welcoming place it wanted to be, they used a more targeted outreach for harder-to-reach families.

6. Clarifying the Oversight Process

The advisory council 's role must be clearly defined during the planning process.

Advisory Council Role

The description of the advisory council's role should include suggested meeting schedules, possible activities of the council, and a clear distinction between decisions that are the responsibility of the council and those that will be left to staff. Following the usual rules for board roles, the council should make overall plans and set policy for the center and leave program implementation decisions to the staff. An important role this representative council plays is that of being the eyes and ears of the program in the community and among the participants and partners in the center. The council's job description should reflect how their input will be regularly and effectively utilized in program operations.

Recommending the coordinator or director to be hired by the center is a way of assuring the council's continued primary role in advising the center. There are a variety of possibilities for sharing responsibility for staff hiring (with the council making the final recommendation):

- recruitment by a search committee which includes members of the advisory council;
- recruitment by the school district and presentation of more than one approved candidate to the council for final choice for recommendation;
- recruitment by the advisory council with presentation of more than one approved candidate to the school board for final decision;
- other options developed by the council.

The first step is to establish the number of council members and the number of representatives from each category to be selected.

Parents on the council should represent the largest group (one-third). Eventually, they should represent the parents who participate in the center and be chosen by the participants. Before the center is operational, another selection method will have to be used. Options to be considered include:

- appointments by the school principal(s;
- appointments by existing school or community parent organizations;
- solicitation of recommendations from a variety of community agencies, churches, and organizations, then selecting members by random drawing;
- a combination of these options (or others). For example, two selected by the principal, four from parent organizations, and three by random drawing.

A minimum of two youths should serve on the youth services center advisory council. Youth representatives to the advisory council should eventually come from center participants. Options for initial selection include:

- representatives chosen by the principals or student councils;
- recommendation by teachers and others in contact with youth, then selected by random drawing.

School staff representatives to the council (not more than one- third) could be selected by the principal or by election among staff or a combination of these two. School district employees who represent specific programs of interest to the center may also be included, and this participation should be taken into consideration when

establishing the number of members and the specific categories to be represented.

Community representatives can be selected according to the interests they represent, to be established at the outset when the total number of members and categories of members are set. For example, based on the needs/resources assessment, it may be determined that the center council should include a juvenile court officer, a representative from the public health department, and the president of the local day-care providers association. Other options might include members appointed by United Way, by the Urban League, by the Mayor, by the local Private Industry Council, by the local consortium of service providers, or by other important local organizations or groups.

In thinking about terms of office, consideration should be given to the intense work that will be required in the first stages of the program as well as to the value of continuity on the Council during that time. One solution might be to establish two-year terms of office, and have half the original council serve a one-year term followed by a two-year term while the other half serves a regular two-year term. This would ensure continuity and would begin the staggered terms of office the council should probably have. In staggering the terms, care should be taken to maintain the appropriate balance of representation among required categories.

Relationships with Local Board of Education or Other School-Based Council

Planners should attempt to enlist the support of the local board of education. They might be asked to approve and thus endorse the plans for the center, including its governance and the council's role in recommending the center coordinator or director, who might even be technically an employee of the local school district.

If the school district is to be involved in this capacity, the description of their relationship to the center should specify the process to be followed in recruiting and hiring the center coordinator or director and the respective roles of the school district and the council, provisions for regular reporting of center activities, and for participation in subsequent planning for the center and in other decisions that may be made by the council. Representatives of the board of education should work with the advisory council to develop the relationship description. It may be helpful to initiate this relationship after the role of the council is defined and after the council has made recommendations on the process of hiring staff.

One effective way of keeping communication open between the groups would be to appoint a member of the school board to serve as an ad hoc member of the advisory council, invited to attend meetings and events connected to the center and to serve as a liaison.

Local Written Agreements

Center planners should obtain local written agreements, assurances of collaboration, both financial and non-financial. These collaborative relationships are essential to the work of the center and to the development of its budget. At one level, written agreements formalize the partnerships that have been developed between the center and other agencies who have agreed to directly contribute funds to the work of the center, to provide services to families referred to them by the center, to loan staff to the center, to provide services at the center site in conjunction with center staff, or to contribute other in-kind services or goods of value.

At another level, these local agreements confirm for the state or other funding sources that the agencies and programs expected to cooperate with the centers are doing so.

7. Thinking about the Budget

Following the design of the family resource/ youth services center, planners must develop a strategy for providing its services. More than likely, the center will have a role in brokering three types of services to children, youth and families:

1) services that are already adequately available for most families,
2) services that are inadequately available and which the center will provide directly,
3) services that may or may not be adequately available and must be purchased by either the center or individuals.

When the desired service is adequate in the community and there are no major barriers (i.e., services are not expensive or exclusive), the center should make a referral agreement with the service provider. This agreement is not meant to reserve slots for center participants, but rather to ensure that a referral by the center results in the family or individual obtaining the appropriate services in a timely fashion.

For example: A parent or youth participating in a center may be interested in obtaining employment services not available at the center. In such a case, the center would need a pre-arranged referral process or the ability to arrange for services to be regularly provided on-site. Most states and municipalities provide these services at little or no cost to the individual, so this would not be a difficult process for a center to develop.

When the appropriate service is not available or an insufficient quantity is available, the center must decide whether to provide the services directly through the center or to work with an outside provider to improve its availability. It must be determined whether the center could physically house the services and whether the center's funds are best spent on the purchase of these services. The services most easily provided directly by the center are those which require larger amounts of physical space, have few capital costs, and demand less professional staff. For example, after-school programs and parent-child interaction classes would fall into this category.

The third type of services that may be needed are ones that would be costly to provide on-site at the center or to purchase from local providers. For this type of service, the applicants must determine how many participants are likely to need them and whether they are able to pay for the services. In situations where participants are able and willing to pay a user fee, the center can act as a broker to obtain the service at the lowest price. In situations where participants cannot afford to pay for the services, center organizers have two options: to spend their limited resources on the purchase of the desired service or to forego the service immediately in hopes of making a case for private or public funds sometime in the future.

Of course, all forms of services and ways of funding them cannot be fully treated in this section. We suggest that you use it as a general framework for developing a financial and service delivery strategy, rather than as a complete formula for planning a center's budget.

Public and Private Resources

The community resources assessment initially conducted for planning should have discovered a few possibilities for privately-provided resources Seeking funding from these community resources is one way to help finance center activities, and one should also consider approaching them for valuable non-financial contributions .

Space, equipment, furnishings, services such as printing, and other in-kind contributions are often available from businesses, churches, or community-service agencies. These resources should be fully utilized before considering using funds to purchase them. These partnerships create relationships that will benefit the center over time.

Many private institutions offer opportunities for families and youth to participate in recreation, workshops and other activities. These should be known to the center, and information about them should be made available to center participants . Some private institutions will also be willing to provide additional activities and assistance needed by local families and youth if the center makes the need for such activities known to them. One of the center's functions is as a community clearinghouse for resources for youth and families. Another is to encourage and develop new resources as they are needed.

Occasionally, staff resources for the center, both paid and volunteer, may be available from churches, community organizations, universities, and other private agencies in the community. These individuals should be thoroughly checked out prior to making agreements for families to be referred to them or for families to come into contact with them in a center setting. Failure to do so can potentially damage the center's credibility with families and undercut an otherwise well-devised program.

An additional cautionary note in using these resources in the center is that it must be ascertained that the center staff has the capacity to train and supervise these additional staff resources before making arrangements to work them into the program. Taking on inexperienced staff, with whatever good intentions, can be disastrous if support for them is not readily available.

In terms of public funding, both the federal government and state governments are looking for new ways to develop human services strategies with a strong emphasis on the integration of services and redirection of existing resources. The trend is toward flexibility, with government giving local jurisdictions the authority to set priorities on how public funds are to be spent in providing social services.

In *The Future of Children: School-Linked Services*, authors Farrow and Joe point out the challenge of making existing expenditures for services more cost-effective. "With this challenge comes the need for new skills and new commitments within a community. Pulling together the needed funding sources is neither simple nor a short-term venture. It requires detailed and extensive knowledge of how money is now spent and of the rules that govern the spending. It requires creativity in combining previously separate funding sources to achieve a new collaborative goal. It requires political skills in making the case for such new financing arrangements. Most of all, it requires agreement among a great many parties that funding sources are going to be assembled in these new ways."
A center's objectives and workplan should provide for data collection and a well-planned periodic analysis of program results to allow for growth and change once the program is operational. Evaluation should be a continuous process and changes in the program should not wait until a year-end evaluation confirms that something is not working as it should. Funding in subsequent years will be dependent on evaluation results, evidence of insightful analysis of strengths and weaknesses, and effective action taken in response to emerging issues.

8. Evaluation Strategies

In planning for an appropriate evaluation of the mission and goals of an individual center and the data collection required to accomplish it, care should be taken to respect and preserve the privacy of center participants as much as possible. Forms which ask questions like income levels, health status, or other confidential information should be used carefully, perhaps not until the family or student has come to the center more than once (unless the family is in need of immediate service that requires the information to be taken). The centers are designed to be as free of intrusions and stigmatizing experiences as possible, and data collection efforts should reflect that philosophy. Staff should be trained carefully in using the required forms and collecting any other information used by the center. The data collection process should be done in such a way that families are fully aware of how the information will be used and are not threatened by the experience.

Year-End Evaluation

A year-end evaluation has two main purposes: to measure results of the year just past and to plan for the coming year. It requires not only collecting information throughout the year that will be useful in determining what happened, but also revisiting the original needs/resource assessment and objectives to see if they need updating in view of the experience of the first year.

Data Collection for Evaluation

The measurable objectives stated early in the planning process give a beginning guide to data to be collected. For example, if a stated objective is: have fifteen low-achieving students participate in a tutorial/mentor activity once a week for twelve weeks, the data that should be collected to measure results is clear. You must have some method of keeping track of how many students participated each week. Possibilities include having students sign in when they come for the activity or taking attendance during the activity, with the attendance record over twelve weeks time kept in the center. Information on activities and services provided off-site should be maintained in the center as well as in the off-site location. Arrangements for data collection should be part of each agreement with other service providers.

In addition to specific activity numbers, information should be kept on center participants overall to give a clear idea of the programs' general impact. How many individuals came to a center activity? How many families? How many times? Unduplicated numbers are more difficult to obtain, but are essential to assessing overall community impact. Although cumbersome, data should be kept by individual record as well as by family record, with information cross-referenced if possible. Data collection should be carefully planned and vigilantly pursued by staff for each activity. It may be helpful to write data collection tasks into job descriptions and workplans to be sure that the tasks are anticipated and completed.

A critical measure of success for a family resource or youth services program is the satisfaction of participants. Number of participants is one way to assess satisfaction in a voluntary program: people simply do not come when they do not benefit from what is going on. Programs may need more refined information than simple attendance numbers to gauge how the program could be better. Periodic surveys of participant re-

sponse, and likes and dislikes for each center activity will give useful evidence of how well the program is being received and suggestions for how it can improve.

Revisiting Last Year's Plan

In the course of the year, information should be collected by the center to update the needs assessment to reflect the experience of the families and students they are serving. For example, case studies could be kept on a random sample of families or youth, fully describing the assets and issues of that family or student and the ways in which they were served, not only by the center, but by other community resources as well. A review of the case studies at the end of the year would reveal gaps in service or point to issues the original needs assessment may have missed.

Surveys or interviews similar to those used in the original planning could also be used to gather information about center participants' needs. Comparing the first year's participants to the community at large could reveal several things: whether the center is serving those whom it intended to serve, whether the services need to be adjusted according to new information about needs, and whether the right combination of other resources outside the center has been devised for the needs expressed by participants.

Once the outcomes listed in the original workplan have been evaluated and new information about needs and resources has been gathered, an analysis of the original plan in light of current information must be conducted. Objectives which were successfully met should be evaluated along with those that were more troublesome. Why was it easy to accomplish some? What overall strengths in the program do the successes point to? Which less-successful aspects of implementation should be changed or repeated?

For objectives that were not met, the questions are sometimes easier: Why not? What were the weaknesses in implementation? Were the plans overambitious? Did they miss the mark with intended participants? Are these objectives really as relevant to the program as they seemed to be in the beginning? Are there strengths in other areas that can be translated to these more difficult ones? What can we do to correct the plan for next year?

Some Final Thoughts

Family resource and youth services centers promise new possibilities for schools and communities. They have the potential to bring together all the available resources in a community—parents, schools, businesses, private institutions and public services—to support the success of every child. The vision behind these programs affirms the uniqueness of every community and the dignity of every family, taking great care to preserve the right of each community to establish its own mission and purpose.

As is true with every human endeavor, the success of a program depends on the human beings who work in it and for it. It depends on their willingness to trust each other, to try something new, to look at issues and problems with new eyes, to give-and-take and listen to one another, and to find new ways of working together.

APPENDIX A

Premises, Principles, and Practices of Family Resource Programs

Premises

As new points of departure for thinking about families and society, the premises that underlie the family resource concept are nonetheless values that most people of all political preferences share. These premises erase the barriers between liberal and conservative approaches and between families and governments. By focusing on the promise of self-sufficiency in families, they allay conservative fears that public programs will create dependency. Likewise, by providing support to families to enhance effective functioning, they allay liberal concerns over the lack of public efforts to benefit families. "These programs create a middle ground where conservatives and liberals can join together to support programs designed to strengthen families and communities" (Weiss, 1989b, p.36). Five premises which underlie family resource programs are:

1. Primary responsibility for the development and well-being of children lies within the family. During the 1970s, there was concern that if families were given support through institutions, nonfamilial agencies would assume too much responsibility for childrearing. Today there is non-partisan recognition that families want to retain full responsibility for childrearing, and want access to necessary resources and support.
2. The cornerstone of a healthy society is the well-being of its families. Dysfunctional families jeopardize the development of future generations of adults, ultimately placing our society at risk.
3. Families exist as part of an ecological system. Children cannot be seen as separate from their families, nor families separate from their communities or from the greater society. Decisions made on behalf of children must integrate and acknowledge their inter-connectedness to the social-ecological system in which they live, making the concept of "saving" a child from his or her environment appropriate only in extreme circumstances.
4. Our society, its communities, institutions, and governments at all levels must assist, not hinder, the capacity of families to raise children. The systems and institutions upon which families rely must effectively respond to their needs if families are to establish and maintain environments that promote growth and development. Systems must be continually evaluated, modified, and coordinated to increase and insure their effectiveness (Garbarino, 1982).

5. Families that receive adequate support are more capable of supporting themselves. It is a myth that any family can "do it alone". Rather, it is through the inter-dependence of people and between people and institutions such as schools, hospitals, and social services that family independence is fostered (Keniston & The Carnegie Council on Children, 1977).

Principles

The above premises underlie the principles upon which family resource programs are based. These principles, which are described below, serve as guidelines for program development and as a blueprint for reorienting more traditional services for families:

1. The most effective approach to families is based in a positive perspective of health and well-being. An approach that builds upon strengths and solutions instead of dwelling and ever-changing stage of life, parenthood is shaped by relationships, life experiences, and knowledge (Benedek, 1970). Parents' sense of confidence and competence emerges out of these dynamics, influencing who they are as people and how they raise their children (Unger & Wandersman cited in Littell, 1985).

3. Childrearing techniques and values are influenced by cultural and community solve,values and mores. Effective involvement with families demands an understanding of and appropriate responsiveness to cultural, individual, and community traditions and values (Spiegel, 1982).

4. Social support networks are essential to family well-being. Social support networks provide parents with the concrete and psychological resources they need in order not to become overwhelmed by their responsibilities (Gottlieb, 1983, 1988).

5. Information about child development enhances parents' capacity to respond appropriately to their children. Informed parents are better equipped to problem- more confident of their decisions, and more likely to respond sensitively to their children's developmental needs (Wandersman, 1987).

6. Families who receive support are empowered to advocate on their own behalf. As an outgrowth of their increased sense of confidence and capability, parents who receive support begin to view themselves as able to act on their own behalf as individuals and as members of a constituency (Pizzo, 1987).

7. Programs for families are most effective when participation is voluntary. Parents who are voluntarily involved in programs are more likely to feel in control of their lives and to be more receptive to change (Zigler & Berman; Valentine & Stark; Fein cited in Powell, 1988).

Qualities of Effective Family Resource Programs and Program Components

In creating and evaluating family support programs that work, the codeword is diversity. There are as many variations of prevention programs for families as there are programs. Programs vary in terms of the populations they target, the settings in which they exist, and the range of programming they provide.

In spite of this breadth and variety, however, effective programs are characterized by a number of key elements. Such programs:

- Incorporate a variety of educational experiences for parents, offering opportunities for them to increase their knowledge and understanding, examine their habitual ways of thinking and doing things, make positive changes.
- Meet parents "where they are." The most effective programs are planned with the involvement of the parents themselves to assure that they are relevant to their specific interests, concerns and needs. Program strategies may span from very structured parent education classes to self-help and support groups, to home visiting, to parent-child activities, to broad-based print or media campaigns.
- Utilize a "building on strengths" approach: a perspective that assumes that all families have strengths that can be utilized as building blocks for growth and improvement. They shun a "deficit" approach, which focuses on deficiencies and problems.
- Acknowledge and address the context in which families exist, appreciating and valuing each family's community and culture, and individual traditions, values and lifestyles. As much as possible, staff members are representative of the population being served by the program. When this is not possible, a "mentor", a representative of the community being served, is included in all planning and decisionmaking. This individual shares insights into the culture, traditions, interests and values of the families, assuring that the program offered is relevant and sensitive to their interests, lifestyles and needs.
- Provide information and support in ways that offer parents alternatives: widening their choices, exploring their options, supporting their potential for change rather than dictating "answers" and solutions.
- Treat parents as partners, appreciating the value, role, challenges and satisfactions of parenthood, as opposed to operating from an orientation that children must be "rescued" from the harmful effects of their families.
- Balance the need parents have to gain information and skills with the need they have to receive attention, care and support.
- Are responsive to the practical needs of parents who participate. These programs provide childcare during group meetings, scholarships when the program charges fees, transportation as needed, and convenient meeting locations, for example.
- Clearly communicate to parents the roles of staff members, volunteers and parents, and the program's goals and philosophy.
- Incorporats outreach efforts to recruit families into the program, to inform the community of its existence, and to promote collaboration with other agencies, services and organizations.
- Promote relationships between staff members and parents characterized by warmth, responsiveness and compassion. In addition, staff members are skillful in relating to both individuals and groups.
- Establish networks of referral and collaboration/coordination with other resources, services and institutions that serve families. Staff members work from an understanding that parent resource programs are not a panacea for all the needs of families or of society.

APPENDIX B

Goals

Family Resource Centers:

- To promote the healthy growth and development of children by assisting families to identify and address any home or community barriers to a child's success in school
- To assist families to develop parenting skills that can promote the optimal development of children;
- To ensure that families have access to and are connected with appropriate community resources and receive from those resources the help that they need;
- To encourage social support linkages and networks among families, thereby reducing isolation and promoting family involvement in community activities;
- To generate optimal parental and family involvement by offering learning and service opportunities that will enable parents and other family members to participate in center and community activities as providers, participants and volunteers.

Youth Services Centers:

- To promote young people's progress toward capable and productive adulthood by assisting them to recognize their individual and family strengths and to address problems that block their success in school;
- To assist young people to make effective use of community resources, including employment and training resources as necessary;
- To promote supportive peer group relationships among young people, and supportive relationships among young people, their families, and persons in the community, in order to develop positive self esteem and competencies; and,
- To generate optimal parental and family involvement by offering learning and service opportunities to enable parents and other family members to participate in center and community activities as providers, participants, and volunteers.

APPENDIX C

Selected Bibliography

The following publications provide two kinds of information: on how to create effective family services programs; and on how to engage public policy, planning, and funding to develop and support family programs with strong frontline components.

Bredekamp, Sue (ed.) ***Developmentally Appropriate Practice in Early Childhood Programs Serving Children from Birth Through Age 8: Expanded Edition,*** **(Washington, D.C.: National Association for the Education of Young Children) 1987.**
This publication provides the NAEYC position statement on developmentally—appropriate practice in early childhood programs as well more specific practice guidelines for children from birth through age three. NAEYC statements are considered to represent the best practice-oriented positions on how to to aid in young children's development.

Bruner, Charles. ***Thinking Collaboratively: Ten Questions and Answers to Help Policy Makers Improve Children's Services,*** **(Washington, D.C.: Education and Human Services Consortium) 1991.**
This guide asserts that "children bring more than educational needs into the classroom" and that strategies to serve children must involve health, education, and human services agencies. It then provides a set of questions to address in developing cross-agency planning groups, in implementing local demonstration projects, and in seeking to expand successful demonstration initiatives statewide.

Bruner, Charles. ***Improving Maternal and Child Health: A Legislator's Guide,*** **(Des Moines, IA: Child and Family Policy Center) 1990.**
This guide outlines a number of state programs to improve maternal and child health, including federal program options available to provide more comprehensive services to support child well-being, broadly defined.

Bruner, Charles. *Frontline Family Workers: The Role of the Family Development Specialist*, (Des Moines, IA: Child and Family Policy Center) August, 1991.
This monograph outlines the work of frontline family workers in exemplary family support and education programs and the institutional supports that are necessary to make their work effective. It draws a clear distinction between the tasks of these frontline family workers and what typically goes under the name of "case management."

Center for the Future of Children. *The Future of Children: School-Linked Services* (Los Altos, CA: David and Lucile Packard Foundation) Vol. 2, #1—Spring 1992.
This issue provides an overview of the complex proposal for schools to play a significantly increased role in the coordination and/or provision of health and social services to children and their families. The publication handles the proposal from multiple perspectives and is accessible to a broad readership.

Center for the Study of Social Policy. *Helping Families Grow Strong: New Directions in Public Policy*, (Chicago: Papers from the Colloquium on Public Policy and Family Support of the Family Resource Coalition) April, 1990.
This collection of commissioned papers represents a source book on family support and education programs and their integration into public policy. It includes descriptions of a number of state initiatives. Authors of the papers include Frank Farrow, Terri Grant, Judy Meltzer, Charles Bruner, Heather Weiss, Robert Halpern, and Gail Christopher. Incorporates discussions of moving from grass roots to state policy, legislating family support and education, and evaluating state family support and education initiatives.

Chynoweth, Judith K. and Barbara Dyer. *Strengthening Families*, (Washington, D.C.: Council of Governors' Policy Advisors) 1991.
This volume, designed for use with state teams in the Policy Academy for Families project, provides a means for assessing the well-being of families and for structuring and coordinating services in a way which is community-based and responsive to family needs. A total of fifteen state teams, composed of leaders in education, human services, state legislatures, and the broader community have participated in or are participating in the Policy Academy for Families, which is designed to redirect state policies in those states to be more family-focused.

Committee for Economic Development. *The Unfinished Agenda: A New Vision for Child Development and Education*, (New York: Statement of the Research and Policy Committee of the Committee for Economic Development) 1990.
This statement, by a committee of corporate and education leaders, emphasizes the need for developing a comprehensive and coordinated system of child development and education that supports families of very young children. Cited in the report as exemplary initiatives are Albuquerque's New Futures School, Missouri's Parents as Teachers program, the Keenan Trust Family Literacy Project, the Chicago Beethoven Project, and the Cities in Schools projects.

Dunst, Carl, Carol Trivette and Angela Deal. *Enabling and Empowering Families: Principles and Guidelines for Practice*, (Cambridge, MA: Brookline Books) 1988.
Based on several years of intensive research on a comprehensive family-supportive program, this book outlines the basic elements of practice needed to insure holistic family development.

Family Resource Coalition. ***A Family Centered Perspective: FRC REPORT,*** **(Chicago: Family Resource Coalition) Vol. IX, #3—1990.**
This issue of the FRC quarterly journal contains several articles and examples of programs which illustrate a family-centered perspective in action. Resources are listed for each.

Family Resource Coalition. ***Building on the Strengths of Communities: FRC REPORT,*** **(Chicago: Family Resource Coalition) Vol. IX, #2—1990.**
This issue of the FRC quarterly centers on the theme of communities and families, with examples of how communities can support families and of the importance of community support for families toward the goal of improved outcomes for children.

Family Resource Coalition. ***Building Parent-School Partnerships: FRC REPORT,*** **(Chicago: Family Resource Coalition) Vol. VIII #2—1989.**
This issue explores the role of family-supportive programs in developing strong partnerships between schools and parents. Examples and additional resources are included.

Fenichel, Emily S. and Linda Eggbeer. ***Preparing Practitioners to Work with Infants, Toddlers, and Their Families: Issues and Recommendations for the Professions,*** **(Arlington, VA: Prepared in collaboration with the TASK Advisory Board. National Center for Clinical Infant Programs) 1990.**
This publication outlines specific criteria for training workers to work with very young children and their families, based on current research in the field and on the experience of nationally known authorities in the field.

Goetz, Kathryn, (ed.). ***Programs to Strengthen Families: A Resource Guide, Third Edition,*** **(Chicago: Family Resource Coalition) 1992.** This guide includes descriptions of a wide variety of examples of community-based family support programs, grouped under the following headings: comprehensive and collaborative programs, school-linked or school-based programs, programs to enhance family functioning, and programs with a family support component. History, budgets and funding streams, populations served, staffing patterns, and community linkages are included for each.

Kagan, Sharon L., Doug Powell, Bernice Weissbourd, and Ed Zigler, (eds.). ***America's Family Support Programs: Perspectives and Prospects,*** **(New Haven: Yale University Press) 1987.**
A complete primer on all aspects of family support programs, featuring chapters by leaders in the field, from history through staffing and program development to policy.

Kagan, Sharon L., Ann Rivera, and Faith Lamb Parker. ***Collaborations in Action: Reshaping Services for Young Children and Their Families,*** **(New Haven: The Bush Center in Child Development and Social Policy, Yale University) 1990.**
This is a critical review of a number of partnerships and collaborations between education, health, and human services designed to provide more effective services for young children and their families. It identifies elements conducive to the success of such initiatives.

Kagan, Sharon L. *Policy Perspectives: Excellence in Early Childhood Education: Defining Characteristics and Next-Decade Strategies,* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Education Research and Improvement, U.S. Government Printing Office) July, 1990.
This work describes American early childhood education as on the verge of a major shift in the conception and definition of its mission—toward linking care with education— and discusses the implications of this shift for public policy.

Kagan, Sharon L. *United We Stand: Collaboration for Childcare and Early Education Services,* (New York: Teachers College Press) 1991.
Kagan's latest work defines essential elements of collaboration necessary for creating a unified, child-centered system of early childhood services to produce the best possible outcomes for all children.

Littell, Julia H. *Building Strong Foundations: Evaluation Strategies for Family Resource Programs,* (Chicago: Family Resource Coalition) 1986.
This manual outlines evaluation techniques for improving the operation of programs; includes sample tracking and intake forms and criteria for appropriate use in family support settings.

National Association of State Boards of Education. *Caring Communities: Supporting Young Children and Families,* (Washington, D.C.: report of the National Task Force on School Readiness) 1991.
The National School Readiness Task Force, chaired by Gov. Bill Clinton, was convened to critically examine the first national education goal, "By the year 2000, all children in America will start school ready to learn." The resulting report describes the need to provide comprehensive, community-based services to families of young children, beginning during the prenatal period.

National Education Goals Panel. *The National Education Goals Report: Building a Nation of Learners,* (Washington, D.C.: National Education Goals Panel) 1991.
This report suggests a series of indicators to measure progress in meeting all six national education goals as well as related state-by-state information.

National Governors' Association. *Focus on the First Sixty Months: A Handbook of Promising Prevention Programs for Children Zero to Five Years of Age,* (Washington, D.C.: The National Governors' Association's Committee on Human Resources and the Center for Policy Research) 1987.
This handbook describes nineteen different state initiatives of "promising prevention programs" for children age birth through five. Included are health-related, education-related, and child welfare-related initiatives.

Pooley, Lynn and Julia H. Littell. *Family Resource Program Builder: Blueprints for Designing and Operating Programs for Parents,* (Chicago: Family Resource Coalition) 1986. This manual describes family support and education program and program principles, and offers advice to practitioners on establishing programs in their communities.

Powell, Douglas R. *Families and Early Childhood Programs* (Washington, D.C.: National Association for the Education of Young Children) 1989.

Riverside County Health Services Agency. *Fixing the System,* video (Riverside, CA: Riverside County Health Services Agency) 1992.
This video is about Riverside County's interagency approach to children's services. The program focuses on 1) schools as a delivery point for social and public health services, 2) the role of the interdisciplinary

case manager as a key link between diverse public agencies and their shared clients, and 3) the importance of designing flexible programs that serve the whole child and family. The video is an effective tool for promoting interagency collaboration at all organizational levels, from elected officials to agency management to field staff.

Romig, Candace (ed.) ***Family Policy: Recommendations for State Action,*** **(Denver: Children, Families, and Social Services Committee: National Conference of State Legislatures) December, 1989.**
This volume describes current federal and state policy, identifies selected state initiatives, and makes recommendations for state legislative action. Among the chapters of particular pertinence to young children are "Parent Education for Parents with Children from Birth to Three," "Families Who Provide Care at Home to Children with Disabilities," and "State Innovations in Children's and Family Services Collaboration and Financing."

Schorr, Lisbeth, Deborah Both, and Carol Copple (eds.) ***Effective Services for Young Children: Report of a Workshop,*** **(Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press) 1991.**
This volume presents a series of commissioned papers from a workshop on identifying the attributes of effective services for young children in at-risk families and the public policies, including state financing strategies, needed to support such services. Schorr's introductory paper describes the attributes of effective services for young children and is an extension of her widely-praised book, *Within Our Reach: Breaking the Cycle of Disadvantage* (New York: Anchor Press) 1988, which includes case studies of a number of exemplary programs for children.

Smith, Sheila, Susan Blank, and James T. Bond. ***One Program, Two Generations: A Report of the Forum on Children and the Family Support Act,*** **(New York: Foundation for Child Development and National Center for Children in Poverty) 1990.**
This volume forcefully articulates the need to focus attention on child development as a part of any welfare-to-work reform initiatives.

Unger, Donald, and Douglas Powell (eds.) ***Families as Nurturing Systems: Support Across the Life Span,*** **(New York: The Hawthorth Press) 1991.**
This volume provides a practice-based and a policy-based analysis of family support and education programs and their connection to changing family dynamics.

Weiss, Heather. ***Pioneering States: Innovative Family Support and Education Programs,*** **(Cambridge, MA: Harvard Family Research Project) 1988.**
This guide describes five state initiatives, including their legislative histories, scope of activities, and reflections from key program developers. The five initiatives are Connecticut's Parent Education Support Centers, Kentucky's Parent and Child Education (PACE) program, Maryland's Family Support Centers, Minnesota's Early Childhood Family Education program, and Missouri's Parents as Teachers program.

Weiss, Heather. ***Innovative States: Emerging Family Support and Education Programs*** **(Harvard Family Research Project: Cambridge, MA: 1989).**
This guide is a companion volume to Pioneering States and describes five additional state initiatives, including Iowa's family development grant program.

Weiss, Heather and Robert Halpern. *Community-Based Family Support and Education Programs: Something Old or Something New?*, (New York: National Center for Children in Poverty, Columbia University) 1991.
This work provides a history of family support and education programs from the nineteenth century on, describes the foundations of current practice, and explores policy, program, and research issues for the future.

Weiss, Heather B. and Francine Jacobs (eds.) *Evaluating Family Programs*, (New York: Aldine De Gruyter) 1988.
This volume provides case study evaluations of a number of family support and education programs, discusses the state of knowledge about family support and education program effectiveness, and examines methodological issues of measuring child and family outcomes and determining program effectiveness. It is considered the best reference work on the evaluation of family programs.

APPENDIX D

Workplan

Needs Statement:

Goal:

Objective:

Proposed Outcome:

Tasks:

Timeline:

Objective:

Proposed Outcome:

Tasks:

Timeline:

(Copy this page to accommodate all your objectives.)